



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.   | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/820,650  | 04/07/2004  | Ron Palmeri          | ODVFP006            | 8494             |
| 22434 7590 02/05/2008<br>BEYER WEAVER LLP<br>P.O. BOX 70250<br>OAKLAND, CA 94612-0250 |             |                      |                     |                  |
| EXAMINER  |             |                      |                     |                  |
| CHEN, YI  |             |                      |                     |                  |
| ART UNIT  |             | PAPER NUMBER         |                     |                  |
| 4152  |             |                      |                     |                  |
| MAIL DATE   |             | DELIVERY MODE        |                     |                  |
| 02/05/2008  |             | PAPER                |                     |                  |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

# Office Action Summary

## Application No.

10/820,650

## Applicant(s)

PALMERI ET AL.

## Examiner

YI CHEN

## Art Unit

4152

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 April 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-56 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-56 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 07 April 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-600)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4/14/2006, 09/27/2004
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-56 are pending in this application.

#### ***Claim Objections***

2. Claim 56 recites, "facilitatig" which contains a typographical error. Appropriate corrections are required.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. **Claims 1-13, 15, 18-31, 33, 36-41, 44-51, 54-56, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Reese et al., (US 7,305,454 B2), hereinafter Reese.**

5. Regarding claim 1, Reese discloses an interoperability system for providing access to a plurality of services by a plurality of users having associated client machines, (col. 5, lines 6-26), each of the plurality of users being associated with one of a plurality of independent enterprises, (col. 4, lines 59-60), the plurality of services being associated with and controlled by a plurality of independent service providers, (col. 6, lines 57-60), and employing a plurality of interfaces at least some of which are not directly interoperable, (col. 3, lines 1-6), the system comprising:

at least one data store having a directory stored therein which maps an identity corresponding to each of the users to a policy framework which defines access policies relating to the services, the identity for each user identifying the associated enterprise, (col. 6 lines 14-28, figure 3), the at least one data store also having a plurality of rich client objects stored therein which are operable to be launched within browser environments on the client machines, (API or URL, col. 7, lines 40-53, col. 4, lines 43-50), and to interact with the services via the interoperability system, (col. 2, lines 41-65, col. 8, lines 17-27); and

at least one computing device, (figure 1, "service manager"), which is operable to connect with each of the client machines and each of the interfaces associated with the services, (figure 1, col. 2, lines 24-40), to selectively upload the rich client objects to the client machines with reference to the directory, and to selectively facilitate interaction among the uploaded rich client objects and the services with reference to the directory, and the policy framework, (col. 2, lines 41-65, col. 8, lines 17-27), thereby enabling the

users associated with different ones of the enterprises to independently access the plurality of services using the interoperability system, (col. 8, lines 17-67, figure 5)

6. Regarding claim 19, Reese discloses a computer-implemented method for providing access to a plurality of services by a plurality of users having associated client machines, (col. 5, lines 6-26), each of the plurality of users being associated with one of a plurality of independent enterprises, (col. 4, lines 59-60), the plurality of services being associated with and controlled by a plurality of independent service providers, (col. 6, lines 57-60), and employing a plurality of interfaces at least some of which are not directly interoperable, (col. 3, lines 1-6), the method comprising:

selectively transmitting rich client objects to the client machines, (col. 2, lines 53-65), the rich client objects being operable to be launched within browser environments on the client machines, (API or URL, col. 7, lines 40-53, col. 4, lines 43-50), and to interact with the services in accordance with a directory which maps an identity corresponding to each of the users to a policy framework which defines access policies relating to the services, (col. 2, lines 41-65, col. 8, lines 17-27), the identity for each user identifying the associated enterprise, (col. 6 lines 14-28, figure 3); and

selectively facilitating interaction among the transmitted rich client objects, (API or URL, col. 7, lines 40-53, col. 4, lines 43-50), and the services in accordance with the directory and the policy framework, (col. 2, lines 41-65, col. 8, lines 17-27), thereby enabling the users associated with different ones of the enterprises, (col. 4, lines 59-60),

to independently access the plurality of services using a single system, (col. 4, lines 30-42, figure 1)

7. Regarding claim 37, Reese discloses an interoperability system for providing access to a plurality of services by a plurality of users having associated client machines, (col. 5, lines 6-26), each of the plurality of users being associated with one of a plurality of independent enterprises, (col. 4, lines 59-60), the plurality of services being associated with and controlled by a plurality of independent service providers, (col. 6, lines 57-60), and employing a plurality of interfaces at least some of which are not directly interoperable, (col. 3, lines 1-6), the system comprising:

at least one data store having a directory stored therein which maps an identity corresponding to each of the users to a policy framework which defines access policies relating to the services, the identity for each user identifying the associated enterprise and a role associated with the user in the associated enterprise, (col. 5, lines 6-26, col. 6, lines 14-28, col. 8, lines 17-52, figure 3), and

at least one computing device, (figure 1, "service manager"), which is operable to connect with each of the client machines and each of the interfaces associated with the services, (figure 1, col. 2, lines 24-40), to selectively facilitate interaction among the client machines and the services with reference to the directory and the policy framework, (col. 2, lines 41-65, col. 8, lines 17-27), and to facilitate consumption of the services in a unique manner for each user in accordance with the corresponding identity, (col. 6, lines 14-28, figure 3).

8. Regarding claim 47, Reese discloses a computer-implemented method for providing access to a plurality of services by a plurality of users having associated client machines, (col. 5, lines 6-26), each of the plurality of users being associated with one of a plurality of independent enterprises, (col. 4, lines 59-60), the plurality of services being associated with and controlled by a plurality of independent service providers, (col. 6, lines 57-60), and employing a plurality of interfaces at least some of which are not directly interoperable, (col. 3, lines 1-6), the method comprising:

connecting with each of the client machines and each of the interfaces associated with the services, (col. 4, lines 35-50);

selectively facilitating interaction among the client machines and the services with reference to a directory and a policy framework, the directory being operable to map an identity corresponding to each of the users to the policy framework which defines access policies relating to the services, the identity for each user identifying the associated enterprise and a role associated with the user in the associated enterprise;, (col. 5, lines 6-26, col. 6, lines 14-28, col. 8, lines 17-52, figure 3), and

facilitating consumption of the services in a unique manner for each user in accordance with the corresponding identity, (col. 2, lines 53-65).

9. Regarding claims 2 and 20, Reese discloses ones of the rich client objects are operable to interact with each other on the client machines, (col. 11, lines 30-60).

10. Regarding claims 3 and 21, Reese discloses at least one computing device is operable to connect with a first one of the client machines in response to a sign-on request, (col. 8, lines 17-27).

11. Regarding claims 4 and 22, Reese discloses at least one computing device is operable to upload at least one of the rich client objects during a sign-on process initiated by the sign-on request, (col. 7, lines 40-53).

12. Regarding claims 5 and 23, Reese discloses at least one computing device is operable to upload at least one of the rich client objects in response to a subsequent request for a corresponding one of the services subsequent to the sign-on process, (col. 7, lines 40-53).

13. Regarding claims 6 and 24, Reese discloses at least one computing device is operable to facilitate interaction with the services using previously installed rich client objects on the client machines, (col. 7, lines 40-53, col. 8, lines 17-27).

14. Regarding claims 7 and 25, Reese discloses at least one computing device is operable to configure the policy framework for a particular one of the services in response to input received from the service provider of the particular service, (col. 5, lines 61-67, col. 6, lines 1-3, col. 6, lines 29-45).



15. Regarding claims 8 and 26, Reese discloses at least one computing device is operable to configure the policy framework for at least one of the users in response to input received from an authorized representative of the enterprise, (col. 4, lines 59-60), associated with the at least one user, (col. 8, lines 17-27).

16. Regarding claims 9 and 27, Reese discloses the policy framework specifies any of access, authentication, and encryption policies for each of the services, (col. 6, lines 14-28, col. 8, lines 41-51).

17. Regarding claims 10 and 28, Reese discloses each user identity includes any of the enterprise associated with the user, a role within the enterprise associated with the user, and an identifier of the client machine associated with the user, (col. 8, lines 8-16).

18. Regarding claims 11, 29, 40 and 50, Reese discloses at least one computing device is operable to connect with each of the client machines using any of HTTP, HTTPS, FTP, Secure FTP, EDI, INT, AS2, SMTP, and SOAP, ("internet", figure 1, "computer network", col. 2, lines 26-30).

19. Regarding claims 12, 30, 41 and 51, Reese discloses at least one computing device is operable to connect with each of the interfaces using any of HTTP, HTTPS, FTP, Secure FTP, EDI, INT, AS2, SMTP, and SOAP, ("internet", figure 1, "computer network", col. 2, lines 26-30).

20. Regarding claims 13 and 31, Reese discloses at least one computing device is operable to connect with selected ones of the client machines directly via a public wide area network, ("internet", figure 1, "computer network", col. 2, lines 26-30).

21. Regarding claims 15 and 33, Reese discloses at least one computing device is operable using the policy framework to allow selected ones of the client machines to retain selected ones of the uploaded rich client objects and other uploaded data when the selected client machines are not connected to the system, (col. 7, lines 40-52).

22. Regarding claims 18 and 36, Reese discloses selective facilitation of the interaction includes facilitation of interaction between two or more of the services, thereby providing access to a composite service by at least some of the users, (col. 4, lines 37-40, col. 5, lines 1-5).

23. Regarding claims 38 and 48, Reese discloses at least one data store also has a plurality of rich client objects stored therein which are operable to be launched within browser environments on the client machines, (API or URL, col. 7, lines 40-53, col. 4, lines 43-50), and to interact with the services via the interoperability system, (col. 8, lines 17-27), the at least one computing device being operable to facilitate the consumption of the services in the unique manner using the rich client objects, (col. 2, lines 41-65, col. 8, lines 17-27).

24. Regarding claims 39 and 49, Reese discloses at least one computing device is further operable to selectively upload the rich client objects to the client machines with reference to the directory, (col. 2, lines 53-65), and to selectively facilitate interaction among the uploaded rich client objects and the services with reference to the directory and the policy framework, (col. 2, lines 41-65, col. 8, lines 17-27).

25. Regarding claims 44 and 54, Reese discloses selective facilitation of the interaction includes facilitation of interaction between two or more of the services, thereby providing access to a composite service by at least some of the users, (col. 4, lines 35-42).

26. Regarding claims 45 and 55, Reese discloses at least one computing device is operable to facilitate the consumption of the services in the unique manner using HTML pages, (col. 4, lines 43-50).

27. Regarding claims 46 and 56, Reese discloses at least one computing device is operable to facilitate the consumption of the services in the unique manner in conjunction with client-side applications, (col. 2, lines 41-65, "API", col. 7, lines 45-47).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

28. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

**29. Claims 14 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reese as applied to claims 1 and 19.**

30. Regarding claims 14 and 32, Reese discloses at least one computing device is operable to connect with selected ones of the client machines via an enterprise network associated with the enterprise associated with the users corresponding to the selected client machines, ("internet", figure 1, "computer network", col. 2, lines 26-30).

Reese doesn't explicitly disclose an enterprise network. However, Reese discloses providing services to organization, (col. 4, lines 50-67, col. 10, lines 27-35). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to realize that the computer device has to connect to the enterprise network in order to provide the service to the client machine who is belonged to the organization.

**31. Claims 16-17, 34-35, 42-43 and 52-53, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reese as applied to claims 1, 15, 19, 33, 37 and 47, in view of Hopkins et al., (US 2007/0078950 A1), hereinafter Hopkins.**

32. Regarding claims 16 and 34, Reese doesn't disclose at least one computing device is operable to receive offline data generated and cached by the selected uploaded rich client objects when the selected client machines are not connected to the system, the offline data being received by the at least one computing device when the selected client machines reconnect to the system.

Hopkins discloses at least one computing device is operable to receive offline data generated and cached by the selected uploaded rich client objects when the selected client machines are not connected to the system, the offline data being received by the at least one computing device when the selected client machines reconnect to the system, (page 7, [0066], "step 540 - step 570", figure 7)

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Reese and the teachings of Hopkins because the client still can access the service when the client machine is offline.

33. Regarding claims 17 and 35, Reese doesn't disclose at least one computing device is operable to generate and cache offline data relating to the selected client machines when the selected client machines are not connected to the system, the at

least one computing device further being operable to transmit the offline data to the selected client machines when the selected client machines reconnect to the system.

Hopkins discloses at least one computing device is operable to generate and cache offline data relating to the selected client machines when the selected client machines are not connected to the system, the at least one computing device further being operable to transmit the offline data to the selected client machines when the selected client machines reconnect to the system, (page 7, [0066], "process 280" and "step 590", figure 7).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Reese and the teachings of Hopkins because the client still can access the service when the client machine is offline.

34. Regarding claims 42 and 52, Reese doesn't discloses at least one computing device is operable to receive offline data generated and cached by selected client machines when the selected client machines are not connected to the system, the offline data being received by the at least one computing device when the selected client machines reconnect to the system.

Hopkins discloses at least one computing device is operable to receive offline data generated and cached by selected client machines when the selected client machines are not connected to the system, the offline data being received by the at least one computing device when the selected client machines reconnect to the system, (page 7, [0066], "step 540 - step 570", figure 7).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Reese and the teachings of Hopkins because the client still can access the service when the client machine is offline.

35. Regarding claims 43 and 53, Reese doesn't disclose at least one computing device is operable to generate and cache offline data relating to selected client machines when the selected client machines are not connected to the system, the at least one computing device further being operable to transmit the offline data to the selected client machines when the selected client machines reconnect to the system.

Hopkins discloses at least one computing device is operable to generate and cache offline data relating to selected client machines when the selected client machines are not connected to the system, the at least one computing device further being operable to transmit the offline data to the selected client machines when the selected client machines reconnect to the system, (page 7, [0066], "process 280" and "step 590", figure 7).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Reese and the teachings of Hopkins because the client still can access the service when the client machine is offline.

***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

Belfiore et al. (US 6,990,513 B2)

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to YI CHEN whose telephone number is (571)270-3805. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30AM to 5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nabil Elhady can be reached on 571-272-3963. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Art Unit: 4152

Yi Chen

1/30/2008

/Nabil El-Hady, Ph.D, M.B.A./

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 4152